

UPPER DESCHUTES RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

LAND USES TEAM

May 28, 2002
10 AM – 1 PM
Prineville BLM Office

Members Present: Bob Wolfenbarger, Clay Penhollow, Matt Holmes, Russ Frost, Ken Florey, Edward Faulkner, Mollie Chaudet, & Team Leader Teal Purrington

Facilitator: Terry Morton

Agenda:

- Review questions about the range of alternatives – general & specific
- Discuss feedback/suggestions for changes – concepts, combinations, specifics – What interests are better met by suggested changes?

Questions and Recommendations:

- Are the Alternatives compatible and consistent with current and expected land use patterns in private & free market sectors? (growth, Urban Growth Boundary changes, industrial boundaries, airport expansion, military use, agriculture, destination resorts, etc.) *Answer: Yes, generally, although some Alternatives accommodate those patterns more than others.*
- Do healthy rangeland standards & guidelines also apply to forest lands (La Pine, etc)? If so, clarify. *Answer: Yes, they do.*
- Will the Alternatives allow for selective thinning of non-old-growth juniper, and its use for wood products (accessibility for multiple use)? *Answer: Yes, some level of harvest is allowed in all Alternatives.*
- Recognizing that heavier traffic flows in some open-range areas (e.g. Millican) will increase the risk of accidents involving vehicles & farm animals, shouldn't we require fencing as a preventive measure, rather than take areas out of grazing altogether? (example: Private lands in Tumalo have been successful in maintaining grazing this way.) *Answer: Fencing can be required under any alternative (common to all), as a means of reducing risk. However, fencing busy roads is less effective on public land than on private land, because on public land you have to figure in vandalism, as well as potential for folks to forget or be unable physically to close gates. For this reason, in the alternative calling for the most reduction in risk of conflicts with neighbors, we eliminate livestock grazing regardless of whether busy roads are fenced.*

- Do some Alternatives solve a problem in one area, only to create problems in other areas by concentrating motorized recreation use? *Answer: Yes. There are tradeoffs in all alternatives. We will evaluate and compare the various impacts during the impact analysis process.*
- Are public lands available for private mining use, or just agency use? *Question for Steve Storo.*
- Multiple Use & Sustained Yield requirements regarding wood products have been overshadowed by environmental & recreation concerns. The Social Survey indicated 45% of Crook Co. use wood from BLM lands, so alts should recognize that economic impact.
- Include some common-to-all solutions to dumping (eg road closures).
- Increase closure distance beyond the rim of the Wild & Scenic section of the Crooked River, to discourage dumping.
- Some Alternatives are not consistent with the Millican OHV Settlement Agreement. *True, this Plan will supercede the Settlement Agreement.*
- Haul distance should *not* be a criterion for determining appropriateness of mining sites – leave all potential sites open, & haul distance can be factored into site-specific decisions during implementation.

First Meeting Review:

- Define rural & urban
- “Conditional Use” – find a new phrase, or at least clearly define
- Phasing will occur during implementation, not necessary in plan
- Safety – OHV/Reservoir Rd/W Butte Rd: ensure safe crossings in implementation (mitigation)
- Concern that Alternatives don’t do enough to restore the land – will rely on Ecosystem Team to evaluate & forward recommendations
- Manage OHV use & shooting areas

Matt’s E-Mail:

- Vacate allotments that have been vacant 10+ years – *Teal had focused on the underlying reasons we would want to vacate them, e.g. fences in disrepair, conflicts with neighbors, WSA, Wild & Scenic, recreation conflicts. Alternative 4 will close most of them. → Teal will check locations of all vacant allotments on maps to see which aren’t closed by any Alternative, & the Team can consider adding additional criteria.*
- Consider potential new law regarding willing sellers of grazing allotments? – *The plan will be amended when/if new laws occur, but can’t really be designed to anticipate potential new laws before they come into effect.*

Sandy’s E-Mail (items not listed below were forwarded to Ecosystem Team):

- Designate special management use areas around guest ranch/destination resorts – *Team was not sure what Sandy meant by “special management use area.” Restrict some uses? If so, just around guest ranch/destination resorts, or around any private land? Will have to ask Sandy at next meeting.*
- Military Use should be conditioned on restoration of other areas not used by the military, to offset environmental impacts on their areas – *currently the military rotates use, & alternates restoration activities; temporary loss, can’t request restoration elsewhere, just because they’re “deep pockets;” ensure the BLM evaluates their restoration efforts & potential impacts in implementation; can’t ask them to pay more than their share until we know whether there’s a permanent impact.*

Other Comments:

- Privately funded study of rangeland health should be independent, based on objective criteria. Any study won’t be completed in time for this Plan, but will speed up implementation.

Action Items: Review Alternatives for gaps or conflicts in integration, as well as website posting of minutes of all Teams’ meetings.

Next Meeting: Friday, June 21, 9 AM – 3 PM at Eagle Crest.

Meeting Evaluation:

+	▲
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You’ve done a great job – much effort • High level of concern & commitment by Team members • “Mostly” friendly • Time – out early 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better turnout